

Steven J. Pitterle  
Director - Negotiations  
Interconnection Services



**Network Services**  
600 Hidden Ridge HQE03B67  
P.O. Box 152092  
Irving, Texas 75038

Phone 972-718-1333  
Fax 972-718-1279  
steve.pitterle@verizon.com

January 17, 2001

Mr. Dan Menser  
Senior Manager – Regulatory Affairs  
VoiceStream Wireless Corporation  
12920 SE 38<sup>th</sup> Street  
Bellevue, WA 98006

Dear Mr. Menser:

Verizon North Inc. f/k/a GTE North Incorporated (“Verizon”), has received your letter stating that, under Section 252(i) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the “Act”), VoiceStream Wireless Corporation (“VoiceStream”) wishes to adopt the terms of the Interconnection Agreement between AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. (“AWS”) and Verizon that was approved by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission (the “Commission”) as an effective agreement in the State of Wisconsin in Docket No. 05-TI-278 (the “Terms”).<sup>1</sup> I understand VoiceStream has a copy of the Terms. Please note the following with respect to VoiceStream’s adoption of the Terms.

1. By VoiceStream’s countersignature on this letter, VoiceStream hereby represents and agrees to the following three points:
  - (A) VoiceStream adopts (and agrees to be bound by) the Terms of the AWS agreement for interconnection with Verizon as it is in effect on the date hereof after giving effect to operation of law, and in applying the Terms, agrees that VoiceStream shall be substituted in place of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. and AWS in the Terms wherever appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup> These “agreements” are not agreements in the generally accepted understanding of that term. Verizon was required to accept these agreements, which were required to reflect then-effective FCC rules and other applicable law.

- (B) VoiceStream requests that notice to VoiceStream as may be required under the Terms shall be provided as follows:

To : VoiceStream Wireless Corporation  
Attention: Mr. Dan Menser,  
Senior Manager – Regulatory Affairs  
12920 SE 38<sup>th</sup> Street  
Bellevue, WA 98006  
Telephone number: 425-653-4695  
FAX number: 425-920-2638  
Email: dan.menser@voicestream.com

And to: Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn PLLC  
Attention: Mr. Brian Lowinger, Esq.  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone number: 202-857-6465  
FAX number: 202-857-6395  
Email: lowingeb@arentfox.com

- (C) VoiceStream represents and warrants that it is a FCC-licensed provider of two-way wireless services, and that its adoption of the Terms will cover services in the State of Wisconsin only.
2. VoiceStream's adoption of the AWS agreement Terms shall become effective upon the date of filing of this adoption letter with the Commission (which filing Verizon will promptly make upon receipt of an original of this letter countersigned by VoiceStream) and remain in effect no longer than the date the AWS agreement Terms are terminated or expire. The AWS agreement is currently scheduled to expire on June 30, 2001.
  3. As the Terms are being adopted by you pursuant to your statutory rights under section 252(i), Verizon does not provide the Terms to you as either a voluntary or negotiated agreement. The filing and performance by Verizon of the Terms does not in any way constitute a waiver by Verizon of any position as to the Terms or a portion thereof, nor does it constitute a waiver by Verizon of all rights and remedies it may have to seek review of the Terms, or to seek review in any way of any provisions included in these Terms as a result of VoiceStream's 252(i) election.
  4. On January 25, 1999, the Supreme Court of the United States ("Court") issued its decision on the appeals of the Eighth Circuit's decision in *Iowa Utilities Board*. Specifically, the Supreme Court modified several of the FCC's and the Eighth Circuit's rulings regarding unbundled network elements and pricing requirements

under the Act. *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board*, 119 S. Ct. 721 (1999). Certain provisions of the Terms may be void or unenforceable as a result of the Court's decision of January 25, 1999, the United States Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals' recent decision in Docket No. 96-3321 regarding the FCC's pricing rules, and the current appeal before the U.S. Supreme Court regarding the FCC's new UNE rules. Moreover, nothing herein shall be construed as or is intended to be a concession or admission by Verizon that any provision in the Terms complies with the rights and duties imposed by the Act, the decisions of the FCC and the Commissions, the decisions of the courts, or other law, and Verizon expressly reserves its full right to assert and pursue claims arising from or related to the Terms.

5. Verizon reserves the right to deny VoiceStream's adoption and/or application of the Terms, in whole or in part, at any time:
  - (a) when the costs of providing the Terms to VoiceStream are greater than the costs of providing them to AWS;
  - (b) if the provision of the Terms to VoiceStream is not technically feasible; and/or
  - (c) to the extent that Verizon otherwise is not required to make the Terms available to VoiceStream under applicable law.
6. As noted above, pursuant to Rule 809, the FCC gave ILECs the ability to deny 252(i) adoptions in those instances where the cost of providing the service to the requesting carrier is higher than that incurred to serve the initial carrier or there is a technical incompatibility issue. The issue of reciprocal compensation for traffic destined for the Internet falls within this exception. Verizon never intended for Internet traffic passing through a telecommunications carrier to be included within the definition of local traffic and subject to the corresponding obligation of reciprocal compensation. Whatever doubt any party may have had with respect to this issue was removed by the Declaratory Ruling that the Federal Communications Commission (the "FCC") released on February 26, 1999 which, among other things, "conclude[d] . . . that ISP-bound traffic is non-local interstate traffic."<sup>2</sup> The FCC also reaffirmed that "section 251(b)(5) of the Act and [the FCC] rules promulgated pursuant to that provision concern inter-carrier compensation for interconnected *local* telecommunications traffic."<sup>3</sup> Based on the FCC's Declaratory Ruling (among other things), it is clear that Internet traffic is not local traffic. Despite the foregoing, some forums have required reciprocal compensation to be paid. This produces the situation where the cost of providing the service is not cost based. With this in mind, Verizon opposes, and reserves the right to deny, the adoption and/or the application of the provisions of the Terms that might be interpreted to characterize traffic destined for Internet as local

---

<sup>2</sup> Declaratory Ruling in FCC CC Docket No. 96-98 and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 99-68 (rel. February 26, 1999), fn. 87. The D.C. Circuit Court has recently asked the FCC to explain more fully its reasoning in arriving at this conclusion in the Declaratory Ruling, but it has not rejected the conclusion. The FCC, moreover, has publicly since reiterated the correctness of its conclusion.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* (emphasis in original).

traffic or requiring the payment of reciprocal compensation. However, Verizon shall, in any case, comply with the requirement of applicable law with respect to this issue.

7. Should VoiceStream attempt to apply the Terms in a manner that conflicts with paragraphs 3-6 above, Verizon reserves its rights to seek appropriate legal and/or equitable relief.

Please sign this letter on the space provided below.

Sincerely,

VERIZON NORTH INC.

---

Steven J. Pitterle  
Director-Negotiations  
Network Services

Reviewed and countersigned as to points A, B, and C of paragraph 1:

VOICESTREAM WIRELESS CORPORATION

---

(SIGNATURE)

---

(PRINT NAME)

c: R. Ragsdale – Verizon